IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	) Group Art Unit: 2423
	)
Kevin Lym	) Examiner: Mendoza, Junior O.
	)
Serial No.: 10/658,929	)
	) **APPEAL BRIEF**
Filed: September 9, 2003	)
	)
For: **INTELLIGENT ROUTING OF**	) 162 North Wolfe Road
DIGITAL CONTENT	) Sunnyvale, California 94086
	) (408) 530-9700
	)
	) Customer No. 28960

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

     In furtherance of the Applicants' Notice of Appeal filed on September 8, 2010, this
Appeal Brief is submitted. This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Applicants' Notice
of Appeal, and further pursuant to the rejection mailed on June 18, 2010, in which Claims 1-54
were rejected. The Applicants submit this Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and
Interferences in compliance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 41.37, as stated in *Rules of
Practice Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (Final Rule)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 49959
(August 12, 2004). The Applicants contend that the rejections of Claims 1-54 in this proceeding
are in error, were previously overcome and are overcome again by this appeal.

I. REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST

As the assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in the above-captioned patent application, the real parties in interest in this appeal, is:

> Sony Corporation, a Japanese corporation
> 6-7-35 Kitashinagawa, Shinagawa
> Tokyo, 141
> Japan
>
> Sony Electronics Inc., a corporation of the State of Delaware
> 1 Sony Drive
> Park Ridge, NJ 07656-8003

per the assignment document filed on September 9, 2003.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The Applicants are not aware of any other appeals or interferences related to the present application.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-54 are involved in the appeal. Claims 1, 5, 6-9, 11, 12, 16-22, 26-30, 41 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0098379 issued to Huang (hereinafter "Huang," a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0022453 issued to Balog et al. (hereinafter "Balog," a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B). Claims 2, 13, 23, 31-33, 37, 40 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,207 to Malek (hereinafter "Malek," a copy of which is attached as Exhibit C). Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,043,477 to Mercer et al. (hereinafter "Mercer," a copy of which is attached

as Exhibit D). Claims 10, 43-45 and 47-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0167318 to Robbin et al. (hereinafter "Robbin," a copy of which is attached as Exhibit E). Claims 34 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Robbin. Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Mercer. Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Robbin and further in view of Malek. Claims 53 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,217 to Colson et al. (hereinafter "Colson," a copy of which is attached as Exhibit F).

IV. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS FILED AFTER FINAL REJECTION

No amendments to the claims have been filed after the Office Action mailed on June 18, 2010.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The invention disclosed in the present application number 10/658,929 is directed to an application which automatically routes digital content to secondary devices and thereby overcomes the traditional problems present with downloading content to secondary devices. The digital content preferably includes file types such as movies, music, images, or anything else that might be stored on a secondary device like an MP3 player or a video recorder. Initially the user must download digital content from a server to the user's computer or set-top box. The routing application compares the file types or alternatively, meta data, of the downloaded content with set values that determine where the content is routed. When the secondary devices are coupled to the computer, the application determines, based on its current settings, which file type is routed to which secondary device and then distributes the files to the appropriate device.

The elements of Claim 1, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, line 13 to page 8, line 22, page 10, line 26 to page 11, lines 18 and accompanying Figures 1, 2 and 3. The apparatus comprises an interface 22 coupled to receive downloaded digital information 1 having a type 11, a storage device 9 coupled to the interface 22 to store the digital information 1 and a routing software 10, wherein the routing

software 10 detects one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to a computing device 3 and to compare the type 11 with a set of values that determine where the digital information 1 is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device 9 to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information 1 based on the type 11 to the one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 detected by the routing software 10.

The elements of Claim 12, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, line 13 to page 8, line 22, page 10, line 26 to page 11, lines 18 and accompanying Figures 1, 2 and 3. The apparatus comprises an interface 22 coupled to receive downloaded digital information 1 having a type 11, a storage device 9 coupled to the interface 22 to store the digital information 1 and a routing software 10, wherein the routing software 10 detects the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 and to compare the type 11 with a set of values that determine where the digital information 1 is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device 9 to automatically determine which type 11 of digital information 1 is routed to which secondary device 14, 15, 16 and selectively transmit the digital information 1 based on the type 11 to the one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 detected by the routing software 10.

The elements of Claim 22, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, line 13 to page 8, line 22, page 10, line 26 to page 11, lines 18 and accompanying Figures 1, 2 and 3. The apparatus comprises an interface 22 coupled to receive downloaded digital media content 1 having a type 11, a storage device 9 coupled to the interface 22 to store the digital media content 1 and a routing software 10, wherein the routing software 10 detects the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 and to compare the type 11 with a set of values that determine where the digital media content 1 is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device 9 to automatically determine which type 11 of media content 1 is routed to which secondary device 14, 15, 16 utilizing a routing table 13 and selectively transmit the digital media content 1 based on the type 11 to the one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 detected by the routing software 10.

The elements of Claim 31, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, line 13 to page 8, line 22, page 10, line 26 to page 11, lines 18 and accompanying Figures 1, 2 and 3. The network comprises a server 2 including digital information 1, a computing device 3 coupled to the server 2 for obtaining and automatically transmitting the digital information 1 based on the type 11, the computing device 3

comprising routing software 10 to compare a type 11 with a set of values that determine where the digital information 1 is to be transmitted and one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 for receiving the digital information 1 from the computing device 3, wherein the routing software 10 detects the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3.

The elements of Claim 41, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, lines 13-24, page 8, line 23 to page 10, line 25 and accompanying Figures 4, 5 and 6. The method comprises receiving the digital information 1 having the type 11, automatically sorting the digital information 1 based on the type 11, automatically detecting the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 and automatically transmitting the digital information 1 based on the type 11 to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 detected by the routing software 10.

The elements of Claim 45, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, lines 13-24, page 8, line 23 to page 10, line 25 and accompanying Figures 4, 5 and 6. The method comprises receiving the digital information 1 having a type 11, automatically detecting the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 with routing software 10 that compares the type 11 with a set of values that determine where the digital information 1 is to be transmitted, automatically sorting the digital information 1 based on the type 11 and automatically transmitting the digital information 1 to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 based on the type 11.

The elements of Claim 52, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, line 13 to page 8, line 22, page 10, line 26 to page 11, lines 18 and accompanying Figures 1, 2 and 3. The apparatus comprises an interface 22 coupled to receive downloaded digital information 1 having a media type 11, a storage device 9 coupled to the interface 22 to store the digital information 1 and a routing software 10, the routing software 10 detects one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to a computer and to compare the media type 11 with a set of values that determine where the digital information 1 is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device 9 to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information 1 based on the media type 11 to the one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 detected by the routing software 10.

The elements of Claim 53, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, lines 13-24, page 8, line 23 to page 10, line 25 and accompanying Figures 4, 5 and 6. The method comprises receiving the digital information 1 having the data format 11 automatically sorting the digital information 1 based on the data format 11, automatically detecting the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 and automatically transmitting the digital information 1 based on the data format 11 to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 detected by the routing software 10.

The elements of Claim 54, directed to one embodiment of the present invention, are described in the Specification at page 6, line 13 to page 8, line 22, page 10, line 26 to page 11, lines 18 and accompanying Figures 1, 2 and 3. The apparatus comprises an interface 22 coupled to receive downloaded digital media content 1 having a data format 11, a storage device 9 coupled to the interface 22 to store the digital media content 1 and a routing software 10, the routing software 10 detects the secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 and to compare the data format 11 with a set of values that determine where the digital media content 1 is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device 9 to automatically determine which data format 11 of media content 1 is routed to which secondary device 14, 15, 16 utilizing a routing table 13, the routing table 13 comprising a data format column 11 and a device column 12 and selectively transmit the digital media content 1 based on the data format 11 to the one or more secondary devices 14, 15, 16 coupled to the computing device 3 detected by the routing software 10.

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION AND OTHER MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The following issues are presented in this Appeal Brief for review by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences:

1.   Whether Claims 1, 5, 6-9, 11, 12, 16-22, 26-30, 41 and 52 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog.

2.   Whether Claims 2, 13, 23, 31-33, 37, 40 and 42 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of Malek.

3.   Whether Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24 and 25 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of Mercer.

4.   Whether Claims 10, 43-45 and 47-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of Robbin.

5.   Whether Claims 34 and 51 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Robbin.

6.   Whether Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Mercer.

7.   Whether Claim 46 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Robbin and further in view of Malek.

8.   Whether Claims 53 and 54 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of Colson.

VII.   ARGUMENT

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 5, 6-9, 11, 12, 16-22, 26-30, 41 and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog.

Outline of Arguments

In the discussion that follows, the Applicants discuss the teachings of Huang, the teachings of Balog and the teachings of the combination of Huang and Balog. As will be discussed in detail below, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

1.   Huang does not teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

Huang teaches a computer program that organizes and manages media files. The computer program includes a database management system for organizing data stored locally on a computer, and a graphical user interface (GUI) for selectively accessing the organized data.

[Huang, ¶ 0025] This organization structure is nothing more than a relational database with pointers and indexes. [Huang, ¶ 0032] The media files being managed are locally stored and accessed. In general, there is no transmitting of data from the local computer to secondary devices, such as an MP3 player or a video recorder. In particular, there is no transmitting of data based on the organization of the media files. The Huang application is specifically designed to organize and manage data locally stored in a database on the local computer on which the application is loaded. As such, as recognized within the Office Action of June 18, 2010, Huang does not teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. [Office Action of June 18, 2010 at page 5] Accordingly, Huang does not teach the presently claimed invention.

2. Balog does not teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

Balog teaches a method for delivering content to a plurality of mobile devices coupled to each other and participating in a communication network. The mobile devices interoperate via a number of radio technologies such as the IEEE 802.11 wireless specification. [Balog, ¶ 0021] The content includes a plurality of data types and is delivered from a service provider to at least one of the mobile devices depending on the characteristics of the data and the characteristics of the device. [Balog, Abstract] Balog teaches that a user with a plurality of devices is able to define a list of preferred devices and create a mapping of the type of content that each of the devices can render. [Balog, ¶ 0031] However, Balog does not teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. Instead, Balog teaches that the content routing application of the mobility server uses user profiles to route content to the correct user, at a specified time, using the most appropriate communication protocol and path to the preferred device. [Balog, ¶ 0029] The routing application of Balog does not detect which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. Accordingly, Balog does not teach the presently claimed invention.

Within the Office Action of December 23, 2009, it is asserted that Balog teaches the claimed detecting of secondary devices by paragraphs [0023] and [0036] and Figures 5 and 6.

Specifically, it is stated within the Office Action that "Balog teaches distributing content, such as video, audio, photos, etc, to devices 16 after determining the device's availability by establishing which devices are connected to service provider 42 at any given moment." [Office Action, page 2] However, the cited portions do not teach wherein a routing software detects one or more secondary devices, instead it merely teaches that the devices self-register with the mobility server 34. In other words, the service provider 42 which comprises the mobility server 34 does not have to try and detect any coupled devices, because the devices register with the mobility server 34 whenever they move into a connectivity area. [Balog, ¶ 0036] A device that self registers is not the same as routing software being configured to actively detect any devices coupled to a computing device. Indeed, in the system of Balog if a device fails to register it will not be discovered by the service provider, whereas the routing software of the presently claimed invention automatically detects secondary devices when they are coupled to the computing device. Thus, Balog does not teach wherein the routing software is configured to detect the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. Accordingly, Balog does not teach the presently claimed invention.

Within the Office Action of June 18, 2010, it is reasserted that Balog teaches the claimed detecting of secondary devices by paragraphs [0023], [0029] and [0036] and Figure 5. [Office Action, page 2] Specifically, it is asserted that "the routine software represented by figure 5 clearly depicts in steps 120 and 130 that a system routing software creates a list of available devices 16 which may receive content and a mobility server 34 determine 130 the status of the available devices." [Office Action, page 2] However, again, the above cited portions of Balog do not teach the detecting of secondary devices. Instead, paragraph [0023] merely discuss the compiling of device characteristics (including device addresses) into a global profile, not how the device address or the devices themselves where discovered/detected. Further, paragraph [0029] of Balog merely teaches the use of a user device configuration in the routing operation, it does not teach that the devices, instead of self-reporting, are detected by the system of Balog. Finally, as described above, not only does paragraph [0036] not teach the detection of the devices, contrarily, it teaches that the devices self-register with the mobility server 34. Specifically, paragraph [0036] states "the device 16 is preferably configured to *register* its location with the mobility server 34 every time it moves into the connectivity area of a new access point 20."

In other words, the server of Balog does not detect when a device connects to the network, but instead the devices themselves register with the server. As a result, as described

above, if the devices failed to register, the server of Balog would not know the devices were there because it does not detect the devices for itself. Indeed, all the subsequent discussion of device lists and their compilation are irrelevant as they do not speak to how the devices were detected. Specifically, although it is asserted in the Office Action of June 18, 2010 that the teaching of creating a list of available devices inherently also teaches the detection of said devices, this logic is incorrect. [Office Action, page 3] A list of available devices could very easily be created without actively detecting them if, as is the case in Balog, the devices self-registered "every time" that they connect to the network. Therefore, again, the only teaching within Balog regarding the discovery of the devices is that, as quoted above, the devices of Balog are configured to self-register with the network such that they do not need to be detected. Accordingly, Balog simply does not teach wherein the routing software <u>detects the secondary devices</u> coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

3. <u>Neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.</u>

In contrast to the combined teachings of Huang and Balog, the computing device of the presently claimed invention performs automatic content sorting and network routing by file type. The computing device has a central processing unit and a storage device. The storage device stores digital content downloaded from the server and a routing software application. The routing software compares the file types of the digital content with set values that determine where the digital content is routed. Specifically, the routing software utilizes a routing table that defines which type of file is associated with which secondary device. The routing software automatically detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and selectively transmits the digital content to the appropriate secondary device(s) according to the routing table. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach wherein the routing software <u>detects the secondary devices</u> coupled to the computer and to compare the <u>data format</u> with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

4.   The claims distinguish over Huang, Balog and their combination.

The claims are grouped separately below to indicate that they do not stand or fall together.

a.   Claims 1, 5-9 and 11

The independent Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for automatically routing digital information. The apparatus of Claim 1 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects one or more secondary devices coupled to a computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 5-9 and 11 are dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 5-9 and 11 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

b.   Claims 12 and 16-21

The independent Claim 12 is directed to an apparatus for automatically routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 12 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be

transmitted, and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of digital information is routed to which secondary device and selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 16-21 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. As discussed above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 16-21 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

     c.   <u>Claims 22 and 26-30</u>

The independent Claim 22 is directed towards an apparatus for automatically routing digital media content from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 22 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table and selectively transmit the digital media content based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 26-30 are dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 26-30 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

        d.   Claim 41

The independent Claim 41 is directed to a method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices based on a routing software that compares a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted. The method of Claim 41 comprises receiving the digital information having the type, automatically sorting the digital information based on the type, automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the type to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

        e.   Claim 52

The independent Claim 52 comprises an apparatus for automatically routing digital information comprising media content of different media types including music, video and data. The apparatus of Claim 52 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a media type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, the routing software detects one or more secondary devices coupled to a computer and to compare the media type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information based on the media type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital

information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 52 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claims 2, 13, 23, 31-33, 37, 40 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of Malek.

Outline of Arguments

In the discussion that follows, the Applicants discuss the teachings of the combination of Huang and Balog, the teachings of Malek and the teachings of the combination of Huang, Balog and Malek. As will be discussed in detail below, neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

5. Neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

6.   <u>Malek does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital</u>
      <u>information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to</u>
      <u>be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing</u>
      <u>device.</u>

Malek teaches a method and apparatus for separately transporting each monomedia
stream of a composite multimedia signal across a network, such as an ATM network. Malek
generally teaches the transfer of packet information from one server to another. [Malek, col. 4,
lines 6-27] The packets of Malek are embedded with addresses to determine the destination.
Malek does not teach any apparatus or method that routes digital information to an appropriate
secondary device by file type. Malek does not teach a routing software that compares the type of
the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be
transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

7.   <u>Neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teach a routing software that</u>
      <u>compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine</u>
      <u>where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary</u>
      <u>devices are coupled to the computing device.</u>

Thus, because neither Huang, Balog or Malek teach a routing software that compares the
type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is
to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device,
neither can their combination. Accordingly, the neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their
combination teach the presently claimed invention.

In contrast to the combined teachings of Huang, Balog and Malek, the computing device
of the presently claimed invention performs automatic content sorting and network routing by
file type. The computing device has a central processing unit and a storage device. The storage
device stores digital content downloaded from the server and a routing software application. The
routing software compares the file types of the digital content with set values that determine
where the digital content is routed. Specifically, the routing software utilizes a routing table that
defines which type of file is associated with which secondary device. The routing software

automatically detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and selectively transmits the digital content to the appropriate secondary device(s) according to the routing table. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

8.   The claims distinguish over Huang, Balog, Malek and their combination.

The claims are grouped separately below to indicate that they do not stand or fall together.

a.   Claims 31-33, 37 and 40

The independent Claim 31 is directed to a network of devices for automatically routing digital information. The network of Claim 31 comprises a server including digital information, a computing device coupled to the server for obtaining and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the type, the computing device comprising routing software to compare a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device for receiving the digital information from the computing device, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teaches a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination.

Claims 32, 33, 37 and 40 are dependent upon the independent Claim 31. As discussed above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 32, 33, 37 and 40 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

b.   Claim 2

Claim 2 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 2 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

c.   Claim 13

Claim 13 is dependent on the independent Claim 12. As discussed above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 13 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

d.   Claim 23

Claim 23 is dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 23 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

e.   Claim 42

Claim 42 is dependent on the independent Claim 41. As discussed above, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 42 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of Mercer.

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. Claims 24 and 25 are dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claims 1, 12, and 22 are each allowable over the

teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24, and 25 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claims 10, 43-45 and 47-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of Robbin.

Outline of Arguments

In the discussion that follows, the Applicants discuss the teachings of the combination of Huang and Balog, the teachings of Robbin and the teachings of the combination of Huang, Balog and Robbin. As will be discussed in detail below, neither Huang, Balog, Robbin nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

9.　　The combination of Huang and Balog does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

10.　　Robbin does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

Robbin is directed to intelligent synchronization of a media player with a host computer. Specifically, Robbin teaches synchronization can be automatically initiated and performed upon connection of a data link between the media player and the hose computer. [Robbin, Abstract]

However, Robbin does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. Accordingly, Robbin does not teach the presently claimed invention.

      11.   <u>Neither Huang, Balog, Robbin nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.</u>

Thus, because neither Huang, Balog or Robbin teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device, neither can their combination. Accordingly, the neither Huang, Balog, Robbin nor their combination teach the presently claimed invention.

In contrast to the combined teachings of Huang, Balog and Robbin, the computing device of the presently claimed invention performs automatic content sorting and network routing by file type. The computing device has a central processing unit and a storage device. The storage device stores digital content downloaded from the server and a routing software application. The routing software compares the file types of the digital content with set values that determine where the digital content is routed. Specifically, the routing software utilizes a routing table that defines which type of file is associated with which secondary device. The routing software automatically detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and selectively transmits the digital content to the appropriate secondary device(s) according to the routing table. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Robbin nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

      12.   <u>The claims distinguish over Huang, Balog, Robbin and their combination.</u>

The claims are grouped separately below to indicate that they do not stand or fall together.

- 19 -

a.   Claims 45 and 47

The independent Claim 45 is directed to a method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The method of Claim 45 comprises receiving the digital information having a type, automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device with routing software that compares the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, automatically sorting the digital information based on the type and automatically transmitting the digital information to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices based on the type. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Robbin nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 45 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Robbin and their combination.

Claim 47 is dependent on the independent Claim 45. As described above, the independent Claim 45 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Robbin and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 47 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

b.   Claims 10 and 48

Claims 10 and 48 are dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 10 and 48 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

c.   Claim 49

Claim 49 is dependent on the independent Claim 12. As described above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 49 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

  d. <u>Claim 50</u>

Claim 50 is dependent on the independent Claim 22. As described above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 50 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

  e. <u>Claims 43 and 44</u>

Claims 43 and 44 are dependent on the independent Claim 41. As described above, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 43 and 44 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claims 34 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Robbin. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 34 and 51 are dependent on the independent Claim 31. As described above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 34 and 51 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Mercer. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 are dependent on the independent Claim 31. As described above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claim 46 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Robbin and further in view of Malek. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 46 is dependent on the independent Claim 45. As described above, the independent Claim 45 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 46 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Grounds for Rejection

Within the Office Action, Claims 53 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,217 to Colson et al. (hereinafter "Colson").

Outline of Arguments

In the discussion that follows, the Applicants discuss the teachings of the combination of Huang and Balog, the teachings of Colson and the teachings of the combination of Huang, Balog and Colson. As will be discussed in detail below, neither Huang, Balog, Colson nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

13. The combination of Huang and Balog does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

14.   Colson does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital
       information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to
       be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing
       device.

Colson is directed to a method and system for receiving and demultiplexing multi-modal
document content. Specifically, Colson teaches that each content type of the multipart document
is located by a component and used to locate an appropriate content renderer. [Colson, Abstract]
However, Colson does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital
information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted
and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. Indeed, Colson is
only cited for the purpose of teaching wherein the routing software compares the data format
with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.
Accordingly, Colson does not teach the presently claimed invention.

15.   Neither Huang, Balog, Colson nor their combination teach a routing software that
       compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine
       where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary
       devices are coupled to the computing device.

Thus, because neither Huang, Balog or Colson teach a routing software that compares the
type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is
to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device,
neither can their combination. Accordingly, the neither Huang, Balog, Colson nor their
combination teach the presently claimed invention.

In contrast to the combined teachings of Huang, Balog and Colson, the computing device
of the presently claimed invention performs automatic content sorting and network routing by
file type. The computing device has a central processing unit and a storage device. The storage
device stores digital content downloaded from the server and a routing software application. The
routing software compares the file types of the digital content with set values that determine
where the digital content is routed. Specifically, the routing software utilizes a routing table that
defines which type of file is associated with which secondary device. The routing software

automatically detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and selectively transmits the digital content to the appropriate secondary device(s) according to the routing table. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Colson nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

16.   The claims distinguish over Huang, Balog, Colson and their combination.

The claims are grouped separately below to indicate that they do not stand or fall together.

a.   Claim 53

The independent Claim 53 comprises a method for routing digital information based on a routing software that compares a data format with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, the digital information comprising media content of different data formats from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The method of Claim 53 comprises receiving the digital information having the data format automatically sorting the digital information based on the data format, automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the data format to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Colson nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 53 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Colson and their combination.

b.   Claim 54

The independent Claim 54 comprises an apparatus for automatically routing digital media content of different data formats from a computing device to one or more secondary devices.

The apparatus of Claim 54 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a data format, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software, the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compared the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which data format of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table, the routing table comprising a data format column and a device column and selectively transmit the digital media content based on the data format to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Colson nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 54 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Colson and their combination.

17.   CONCLUSION

    For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Claims 1-54 are allowable over the cited prior art references. Therefore, a favorable indication is respectfully requested.

                                        Respectfully submitted,
                                        HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: October 28, 2010   By: /Jonathan O. Owens/
                                        Jonathan O. Owens
                                        Reg. No.: 37,902
                                        Attorney for Applicant

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

This appendix includes a list of the claims under appeal.

1.   An apparatus for automatically routing digital information, comprising:
    a.   an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type;
    b.   a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a
        routing software, wherein the routing software detects one or more secondary
        devices coupled to a computing device and to compare the type with a set of
        values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted; and
    c.   a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively
        transmit the digital information based on the type to the one or more secondary
        devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software.

2.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the digital information is downloaded from a
server to the storage device.

3.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the storage device is a hard disk drive.

4.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the storage device is a semiconductor
memory.

5.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the digital information comprises media
content including music, videos, and data.

6.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the controller utilizes a routing table to route
the digital information.

7.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 6 wherein the routing table further comprises a file
type column and a device column.

8.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 6 wherein the routing table utilizes meta data information within the digital information to route the digital information.

9.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 6 wherein the routing table is user-defined.

10.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the controller automatically detects one or more secondary devices.

11.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the secondary devices include one or more of an mp3 player, a video recorder, and a handheld.

12.   An apparatus for automatically routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices, comprising:

    a.   an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type;

    b.   a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted; and

    c.   a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically:

        i.   determine which type of digital information is routed to which secondary device; and

        ii.   selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software.

13.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 12 wherein the digital information is downloaded from a server to the storage device.

14.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 12 wherein the storage device is a hard disk drive.

15.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 12 wherein the storage device is a semiconductor memory.

16.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 12 wherein the digital information comprises media content including music, videos, and data.

17.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 12 wherein the controller utilizes a routing table to route the digital information.

18.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 17 wherein the routing table further comprises a file type column and a device column.

19.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 17 wherein the routing table utilizes meta data information within the digital information to route the digital information.

20.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 17 wherein the routing table is user-defined.

21.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 12 wherein the secondary devices include one or more of an mp3 player, a video recorder, and a handheld.

22.   An apparatus for automatically routing digital media content from a computing device to one or more secondary devices comprising:

      a.   an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a type;

      b.   a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted; and

      c.   a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically:

           i.   determine which type of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table; and

           ii.   selectively transmit the digital media content based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software.

23.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the digital media content is downloaded from a server to the storage device.

24.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the storage device is a hard disk drive.

25.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the storage device is a semiconductor memory.

26.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the digital media content includes music, videos, and data.

27.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the routing table further comprises a file type column and a device column.

28.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the routing table utilizes meta data information within the digital information to route the digital information.

29.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the routing table is user-defined.

30.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the secondary devices include one or more of an mp3 player, a video recorder, and a handheld.

31.   A network of devices for automatically routing digital information comprising:
        a.   a server including digital information;
        b.   a computing device coupled to the server for obtaining and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the type, the computing device comprising routing software to compare a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted; and
        c.   one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device for receiving the digital information from the computing device;
        wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device.

32.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 31 wherein the digital information comprises media content including music, videos, and data.

33.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 31 wherein the computing device further comprises:

      a.   an interface coupled to receive the digital information having a type;

      b.   a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information; and

      c.   a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and distribute the digital information based on the type to one or more secondary devices.

34.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 33 wherein the controller automatically detects the one or more secondary devices.

35.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 33 wherein the storage device is a hard disk drive.

36.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 33 wherein the storage device is a semiconductor memory.

37.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 31 wherein the computing device is a personal computer.

38.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 31 wherein the computing device is a set-top box.

39.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 31 wherein the computer device further comprises a modem device for coupling to the server.

40.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 31 wherein the secondary devices comprise an mp3 player, a video recorder, and a handheld device.

41.   A method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices based on a routing software that compares a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, comprising:

      a.   receiving the digital information having the type;

      b.   automatically sorting the digital information based on the type;

     c.   automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device; and

     d.   automatically transmitting the digital information based on the type to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software.

42.   The method as claimed in claim 41 further comprising downloading the digital information from a server to the computing device.

43.   The method as claimed in claim 41 further comprising automatically detecting the secondary devices.

44.   The method as claimed in claim 41 further comprising storing the digital information in the computing device until the corresponding one or more of the secondary devices is coupled to the computing device.

45.   A method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices, comprising:

     a.   receiving the digital information having a type;

     b.   automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device with routing software that compares the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted;

     c.   automatically sorting the digital information based on the type; and

     d.   automatically transmitting the digital information to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices based on the type.

46.   The method as claimed in claim 45 further comprising downloading the digital information from a server to the computing device.

47.   The method as claimed in claim 45 further comprising storing the digital information in the computing device until the corresponding one or more of the secondary devices is coupled to the computing device.

48.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the digital information is stored on the storage device until the one or more secondary devices are available to receive the digital information.

49.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 12 wherein the digital information is stored on the storage device until the one or more secondary devices are available to receive the digital information.

50.   The apparatus as claimed in claim 22 wherein the digital media content is stored on the storage device until the one or more secondary devices are available to receive the digital media content.

51.   The network of devices as claimed in claim 31 wherein the digital information is stored on the computing device until the one or more secondary devices are available to receive the digital information.

52.   An apparatus for automatically routing digital information comprising media content of different media types including music, video and data, the apparatus comprising:

    a.   an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a media type;

    b.   a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, the routing software detects one or more secondary devices coupled to a computer and to compare the media type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted; and

    c.   a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information based on the media type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software.

53.   A method for routing digital information based on a routing software that compares a data format with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, the digital information comprising media content of different data formats from a computing device to one or more secondary devices, comprising:

a. receiving the digital information having the data format;

b. automatically sorting the digital information based on the data format;

c. automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device; and

d. automatically transmitting the digital information based on the data format to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software.

54. An apparatus for automatically routing digital media content of different data formats from a computing device to one or more secondary devices, comprising:

a. an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a data format;

b. a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software, the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compared the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted; and

c. a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically:

i. determine which data format of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table, the routing table comprising a data format column and a device column; and

ii. selectively transmit the digital media content based on the data format to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software.

IX.   EVIDENCE APPENDIX

STATEMENT

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix), the following is a statement setting forth where in the record the evidence of this appendix was entered by the examiner:

Evidence Description:	Where Entered:
U.S. Patent No. 6,708,217	Office Action mailed June 18, 2010
U.S. Patent App. No. 2003/0167318	Office Action mailed February 4, 2009
U.S. Patent No. 7,043,477	Office Action mailed March 5, 2008
U.S. Patent No. 6,253,207	Office Action mailed March 5, 2008
U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0022453	Office Action mailed July 6, 2009
U.S. Patent App. No. 2004/0098379	Office Action mailed February 4, 2009
Office Action of June 18, 2010	Examiner Office Action
Office Action of December 23, 2009	Examiner Office Action
Office Action July 6, 2009	Examiner Office Action

X.   RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.